



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/752,114	12/28/2000	Galen C. Hunt	MS1-523US	8218
22801	7590	11/23/2005	EXAMINER	
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			WILLETT, STEPHAN F	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2142	
DATE MAILED: 11/23/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 09/752,114	Applicant(s) HUNT, GALEN C.
	Examiner Stephan F. Willett	Art Unit 2142
<u>-The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</u>		
THE REPLY FILED 25 October 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.		
<p>1. <input type="checkbox"/> The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:</p> <p>a) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>b) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p> <p>Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).</p>		
<p>Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</p>		
NOTICE OF APPEAL		
<p>2. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>06 October 2005</u>. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).</p>		
AMENDMENTS		
<p>3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because</p> <p>(a) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(b) <input type="checkbox"/> They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</p> <p>(c) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</p> <p>(d) <input type="checkbox"/> They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</p>		
<p>NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).</p>		
<p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).</p>		
<p>5. <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.</p>		
<p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</p>		
<p>7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> will not be entered, or b) <input type="checkbox"/> will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.</p>		
<p>The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</p>		
<p>Claim(s) allowed: _____.</p>		
<p>Claim(s) objected to: _____.</p>		
<p>Claim(s) rejected: <u>28-30 and 48-64</u>.</p>		
<p>Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.</p>		
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		
<p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</p>		
<p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).</p>		
<p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.</p>		
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		
<p>11. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></p>		
<p>12. <input type="checkbox"/> Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.</p>		
<p>13. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.</p>		
 ANDREW CALDWELL SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The amendment filed on 8/5/05 has now been entered. However, in summary, by default "subsequent requests" are "continually routed to preserve state information" and/or "maintain the state information", Paper Filed 10/25/05, page 15, lines 4-6. Thus, it is suggested clarity in how and/or when state information is routed. This is relevant since Applicant suggests state information "expires and [be] removed from memory", Paper Filed 10/25/05, page 15, line 7. However, the limitations "rather than the state information being kept at either of the two endpoints", Paper Filed 8/5/05, pg. 12, lines 24-25 and "the SCONE 470 is not kept at one router, but instead is continuously routed among various network components", Paper Filed 8/5/05, pg. 14, line 13 as suggested is not claimed. "Nowhere does Bayeh ever show or consider a network between the client(s) and the server cluster", Paper Filed 8/5/05, pg. 18, lines 5-6 is also not claimed as suggested. Also based on the analysis provided, the generic "network" suggested is not claimed and is not reasonable based on the common usage of "network" since there are many "networks" described in Bayeh. "The Internet", col. 1, line 20 of Bayeh is stateless and as admitted "the entity in Bayeh that handles the reassociation process", Paper Filed 8/5/05, pg. 19, lines 8-9 as well as the "session server" "reassociates these session objects", Paper Filed 8/5/05, pr. 19, line 4, and these elements also satisfy claim 30 and the "network components". Applicant suggests "the session server is not the same as the 'multiple network components'", Paper Filed 10/25/05, page 19, line 19 is correct since Bayeh teaches multiple network components as "servers", col. 11, line 7. "Reassociated" "session objects" is clearly described as the session object "can be accessed for subsequent transactions", col. 11, lines 3-4 and said network components do this on a continual basis as needed, or randomly, lines 61-62 as taught at col. 14, lines 43-45 to "modify any fields of this object that can be updated", col. 14, lines 63-66